DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 121 CS 503 582

AUTHOR Kipper, Philip
TITLE The Television News Report as Persuasive Message.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (58th, Salt Lake City, UT, February 14-17, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Discourse Analysis; Mass Media Effects; *News Reporting; *Persuasive Discourse; *Rhetoric; Rhetorical Criticism; *Television Research; Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *CBS Evening News; *Television News

ABSTRACT

Three typical television news reports broadcast on the "CBS Evening News with Dan Rather" in early 1987 were analyzed (1) to test the validity of the assumption that news reports of this type are persuasive and therefore can be classified as rhetoric and (2) to gain insights into the message structure of the reports. The three reports analysed were: a business report on the rise of the stock market, a news story about how President Reagan's budget proposals affected his anti-drug program, and a news story about evangelist Oral Roberts' revelation that he would die if he could not raise several million dollars. The analyses, using neo-Aristotelian criteria, revealed the reports to be tightly packaged persuasive arguments, each defining oppositional issues, setting out logical deductive arguments, and supporting those arguments with reasoned and emotional evidence. In addition, each report defined an audience more specific than the mass audience usually assumed for network television news, then encouraged that audience to accept the persuader's view by the use of value-laden statements and by certain credibility enhancing techniques. The findings suggest that viewers should become more aware of the argumentative structure of news and the presentational formats in which that structure is presented. (Transcripts of the three news reports are appended.) (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED280121

The Television News Report as Persuasive Message

By Philip Kipper

Assistant Professor of English,
Communication Program Coordinator
Mills College, Oakland, CA 94613

Presented to the Western Speech Communication Assoc.
Salt Lake City, Utah
February 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Philip Kipper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505582

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reporters sometimes assume considerable inventive license as they go about gathering and presenting the news. This circumstance was acknowledged by none other than Walter Lippmann when he suggested that fiction and reporting have more than a few similarities.[1] The observation was not meant pejoratively. According to Lippmann, a work of fiction can range considerably in its fidelity, and as long as that fact is taken into account fiction is not inherently misleading.

Lippmann's concept of news thus differs dramatically from the principle of objectivity drummed into the head of every budding journalism student. As one popular college text puts it: "Newspaper reporters are expected to be neutral observers, not advocates or participants. Reporters cannot discriminate against any ideas or tell their readers what to think about these ideas."[2] From Lippmann's perspective this position is hopelessly untenable. Reporting about reality inevitably means creatively altering or reshaping it--turning it into a "fiction" that can be more conveniently examined, much like a scientific model. A news report as "fiction" is thus a creatively devised facsimile that is not the "truth," but is good or useful in so far as it persuades readers or listeners of its truthfulness.

Seen in this light, news stories may have more in common with rhetoric than ordinary fiction. Indeed, this is an idea that

finds support in the writings of such rhetorical critics as Forbes Hill and Edwin Black. The locus of critical interest, Hill argues, is in the relationship between a specific message and a specific audience. An effective and well targeted message (e.g.a news story) evokes rational judgments and emotional feelings that allow the audience to accept and embrace the message. Like a scientific model, the message is valuable and believable in proportion to how useful it is made to seem and how isomorphic it appears to the reality of the receiver.[3] And Black notes that even if an author's work has the stated intention of not being persuasive (as might be the case in news reporting), if there is evidence of covert persuasion then the work is by definition rhetorical.[4]

Much can be gained by examining news reports as rhetoric. First, one may discard objectivity and bias as critical criteria and look instead at argumentative structure, emotional and logical proofs, and audience response. Operating under the assumption that news is persuasive allows one to probe the use of emotion-laden evidence or to investigate the manner in which journalists attune their reports to the values of the audience.

Hill, like other neo-Aristotelian critics, rests his critical method on the concepts of *logos*, *pathos*, and *ethos*. The critic examines the logical argument or ethymeme to determine the types of evidence or proofs that are employed or perhaps to classify

the syllogistic reasoning. Also investigated are the psychological or emotional conditions in the audience such as values. Finally, the critic examines the qualities of the persuader that allow the audience to invest him or her with credibility.[5] The key notion here is that the persuader's success as judged by the critic is not determined by the performance as such. Rather, success depends on the degree to which the message allows the audience to summon up pre-existing feelings and logical judgments. This critical emphasis thus directs the critic to analyze the potential effect of the message rather than the motivations of the sender. Furthermore, because of this emphasis the critic must take into account the persuader's apparent assessment of the audience as well as his or her definition of the issues. This latter point is important because neo-Aristotelian analysis defines an issue as a clash of opposites. The critic must therefore attempt to identify the opposing sides whether they are explicit in the message or not.

This paper will use this critical outline to analyze three typical television news reports broadcast in early January 1987 on the CBS Evening News with Dan Rather. The main objectives of this investigation are to test the validity of the assumption that news reports of this type are indeed persuasive and therefore may be classified as rhetoric and to gain insights into the message structure. Each report will be examined to define

the main oppositonal issue or issues; to explicate the logical argument and evidence; to explore psychological and emotional content, used either as evidence or as a means of establishing the report's credibility; and to identify the audience assumed by the reporter.

Unlike other forms of persuasion such as political speeches or advertising, television news reports are ostensibly non-persuasive. Yet as this paper will make clear, these reports employ powerful persuasive tools. For example, visual images used for emotional effect or evidence, are inherently persuasive because they play upon the sense of sight, the source of information human beings trust most. In addition, the television news report can present the actual images and voices of authorities, further adding to the credibility of the message. How the reporter selects and arranges the narrative, as well as the visual and sound images, is thus at the heart of the persuasive act.

Analysis One

January 8, 1987 the CBS Evening News led off its broadcast with a report by business correspondent Ray Brady about that day's record breaking level of the Dow-Jones Industrial Average. For the first time in history the average had gone above 2,000 (see Appendix A for transcript). Anchorman Dan Rather introduced

the report in glowing terms. The record was the latest surge in the great bull market of the 1980s, "the most successful millionaire maker of all time."

This enthusiastic tone of voice was taken up by Brady, who begins his report by describing the celebrations of stock brokers after trading had closed. Visuals show traders lighting up cigars, followed by scenes of the day's frantic action on the floor of the exchange.

The viewer next sees a graph charting the rise of the stock market from 1897 to the present as Brady describes the history of market increases. A brief interview then follows with market analyst William LeFevre who observes that the smaller investor is an important contributor to market gains. Brady's voice comes on once again, saying that the impact of the market is nationwide. We see scenes of a brokerage house in Seattle and there are two brief interviews with typical small investors, both of whom seem enthusiastic about the day's events.

Finally, the screen again shows the stock exchange floor and more frantic traders; the viewer can also see cameras and reporters observing the scene. Brady notes the press coverage in favorable terms. The viewer then sees Brady sitting at a desk in the Evening News set. His final words are optimistic: "Nobody can be sure [if the market will continue to rise] because the economy is weak. But as one broker put it tonight, nobody's

selling everybody's saying let the money ride and we'll see what happens. Dan."

Though on the surface this report seems like a fairly straightforward summary of an important event, closer scrutiny reveals it to be a carefully designed persuasive message aimed at a specific audience. The audience in this case is not the heterogeneous viewership usually assumed for television news. Rather it is the small investor, as contrasted with the institutional investors whose computer controlled buying and selling practices have strongly influenced the market lately.

This audience focus is revealed in the selection of interview material as well as certain visual images. For example, three of the four individuals interviewed on camera either discussed the position of the small investor or were themselves small investors. The fourth person was a Wall Street Trader.

To paint an informative picture for a general audience Brady could as well have interviewed economists, business professors, or even stock brokers. That he chose instead to interview individuals with such a limited vantage point suggests a desire to speak directly to that audience.

The definition of audience is crucial because it leads to an understanding of the persuasive structure employed in the report. What, for example, is the key oppositional issue being presented?

If the main target audience is small investors, then it becomes clear that the report presents an underlying opposition between "what is good for all of us" and "what is good for a few large institutions or fat cats."

Indeed, the enthusiastic tone, the glowing statistics and the visual evidence of stock market strength support the supposition that the main issue the report deals with is optimism vs. pessimism. Or in different terms: This market is good for everyone and there is reason for optimism despite the weak economy versus the interpretation that this is just another round of profits for a few rich investors or large instititutions and the economy is weak anyway.

The report takes up this issue with a relatively simple logical argument: The market continues to climb, which is good for traders as well as small investors. A booming stock market is thus reason for optimism for us all (meaning primarily those with some stake in the market). This argument can be given the form of a somewhat untidy conditional syllogism: If the stock market is going up and that is good for everyone, then happy days are sure to follow.

The report supports this argument by certain reasoned as well as emotion-laden evidence. In addition, the report contains a number of emotional or psychological appeals that would clearly resonate with the intended audience.

Visual evidence includes shots of frantic traders and happy investors lighting up cigars. One man is shown with three cigars in his mouth, suggesting that this is a day for exceptional celebrations. In addition, there is the interview with the delighted trader who's a buyer and not a seller and loves it. Visual images and voices of contented small investors as they watch the averages climb, adds further support to the argument. The weight of the evidence is simply that this is an optimistic moment and that it's good for everyone. The animated graph showing the stock market climbing from 1897 to its present all-time high further supports the notion that extraordinary times are upon us.

The psychological appeals in the report are a somewhat uncomfortable blend of conservativism and adventurousness. Yet they represent a textbook case of American value statements. Most fundamental is the notion of competitiveness that is inherent in the event itself. The stock market's rise is like a race, an effort to surpass a record or barrier, a notion that inevitably appeals to the competitive spirit supposedly held dear by most Americans. The report from the very start draws attention to the race-like qualities of the new record but ignores the fact that the 2,000 level is only an artificial marker and has no real economic relevance.

Americans also admire the risk taker, and perhaps even the gambler. Thus, when the camera shows a stock trader declaring himself to be a buyer--that is, a bull--it is assumed that we will admire his optimism and his willingness to take a chance, a very persuasive appeal. Similarly, when Brady ends the report by invoking the gambler's phrase, "let the money ride," he is aligning himself with this deeply held value.

On the other hand, the report also appeals to more moderating values. The interviews with the small investors suggests concern for the "little guy," an important part of the American tradition. Futhermore, implicit in the report is a statement of national unity--if not brotherhood. At one point, Brady intones: "And around the country today, investors flocked into brokerage houses to be on hand for the big day." This phrase is accompanied by a view inside such a brokerage house, labeled "Seattle, Washington." One clear meaning here is that the country is together on this, even in such remote (from New York) places as Seattle, Washington.

With such simple yet potent appeals this report seems inevitably persuasive, especially to an audience of small investors, who for the most part are likely to be from the middle classes. Adding further to this impact is the kit bag of credibility enhancing tools employed by the reporter/persuader. It is Brady's ebullient voice that introduces the viewer to the

facts and figures of the news as well as the concrete visual images. This association between concrete evidence and the persuader's voice inevitably contributes to his authority and believability. Finally, this message of credibility is sealed as we see Brady on camera sitting next to the anchorperson, the ultimate pronouncer upon the day's events.

The foregoing analysis is not meant to insinuate persuasive intent on the part of Brady or the CBS producers, though it may well have been there. Rather, the analysis demonstrates a persuasive outcome. The selection of certain images and voices to the exclusion of other logical choices, the evident targeting of a specific audience, and the presence of value based appeals suggests that this news report is far more than objective description.

Analysis Two

Later in the same newscast reporter Rita Braver tells viewers about President Reagan's latest budget proposals and how he hopes to cut nearly $1 billion from law enforcement programs and other projects aimed at the drug problem. But the underlying issue implicit in the report is not opposing spending priorities. Rather it is a question of presidential integrity.

The opening segments draw attention to the massive anti-drug publicity campaign mounted by Reagan just prior to the 1986 mid-

term elections. The viewer sees Nancy Reagan singing an anti-drug song with a group of children. There are shots of two well known athletes practicing the "just say no to drugs" slogan with a group of students. The President himself appears on camera signing an anti-drug spending bill before an audience of young people, some of whom are wearing "just say no" t-shirts. "The American people want their government to get tough and to go on the offensive and that's exactly what we intend," the President says. Reporter Braver points out that the bill signing took place with "great ceremony" eight days before the election.

Following this sequence of images comes a significant transition in the report. Braver declares that "now, however, the administration has slashed nearly a billion dollars from drug busting programs, the biggest cut, $225 million for state and local law enforcement. In Congress, both Democrats and Republicans feel betrayed." This commentary is voiced over images of plain clothes policemen rushing toward a seedy looking public housing project with drawn guns. Subsequent shots show officers handcuffing drug suspects and leading them away.

Next the viewer sees a congressman who explains that with the increase in drug trafficking more must be done, not less. There is then a cut to show the Presidential seal superimposed above what appears to be a statitical document. Braver explains that the White House has responded to such criticism with a fact

sheet claiming that the initial big budget Reagan proposals were for startup costs only--one-time expenses. Braver also notes that the President's former drug adviser has defended the White House by saying that money isn't really the cure to the drug problem. Carlton Turner, the former drug adviser, then appears on camera to reiterate this point. "Let's hold the user accountable for his or her actions," he says.

The viewer next sees a classroom with a teacher speaking to students; cut to a shot of an unconscious person being wheeled into a hospital emergency room. Braver's voice over these images says that funding for education and treatment is also down and local governments say "that will hurt."

The image that now appears on the screen is that of Nick Navarro, identified as Broward County Sheriff. "It takes three things to win a war--and we are at war with drugs-- that's money, money, and more money," Navarro says.

The report concludes with Braver on camera: "The response from Capitol Hill to the President's new drug budget may have a familiar ring: Congress is likely to just say no. Rita Braver, CBS News Washington."

This report has two parts. The first shows a sequence of positive images of Reagan and his wife taking dramatic action against drugs. Many of the shots show the Reagans posing with wholesome young people who are "just saying no." The second

part, in marked contrast, shows scenes of scruffy looking drug users and pushers being led to jail in handcuffs. At other moments we see a victim of drugs being wheeled into a hospital. The voices we hear are sometimes angry or tense because the speakers object to the President's budgetary proposals.

Clearly the message of this sequence of images is that the President has let people down, primarily because the anti-drug campaign before the election was simply for political show. In addition, it becomes evident on further analysis that one of the report's main objectives is to persuade viewers that money, and the law enforcement it will buy, is perhaps the most important ingredient for solving the drug problem.

The sequence of the report reveals several related oppositional issues: integrity or steadfastness versus political manipulation; fighting drugs with police action and money versus politics as usual; and healthfulness (or the Reagan Administration's contrived view of it) versus degradation (the apparent reality of drug use). On the broadest level, the main oppositional issue in this report is the moral integrity of the nation versus corruption. Corruption in this case is embodied in Reagan's apparent ethical lapse as well as the physical and moral decrepitude wrought by drugs.

These issues, though only implied in the report, are revealed in the main argumentative structure, which can be stated

deductively as follows: The President made a big demonstration of support for a massive anti-drug campaign but now that the election is over there is little political gain to be had from massive spending, and anyway money isn't the cure for the drug problem. But, in fact, money is the cure for the drug problem because fighting drugs is like a war. We need funding not only for police but for education and treatment. Therefore, the President is wrong and has let everybody down and Congress should set him straight.

This logic takes the shape of a disjunctive syllogism, an either-or statement. Either you fight drugs with money or you don't fight drugs. By cutting back funding we're not really fighting drugs.

As mentioned above, this argument is revealed in the sequential structure of the report, which contrasts Reagan's pre-election actions with vivid images of the consequences of his later non-action. Evidence is thus presented in the form of contrasting visual images. On the one hand, the viewer sees smiling and well scrubbed young people joining in the President's earlier anti-drug campaign. But now that we have learned that the President is no longer so avid to spend money to combat drugs, we see the consequences of this action: unsavory looking drug users being frisked and handcuffed. Also used as powerful evidence are the shots of a classroom, where we are now led to

believe drug education will no longer take place. Most frightening, however, is the view of the unconscious addict being wheeled into the emergency room.

In the midst of these powerful images, the reporter offers the White House an opportunity for a rebuttal. It is an adept use of the straw man strategy. First, the reporter notes that the White House has responded with a fact sheet. "A mere fact sheet," says the tone of her voice. Then we see and hear the former White House drug adviser, whose brief verbal statement hardly carries the perusasive weight of the earlier action shots of drug abusers. It is a weak rebuttal at best.

Among the key persuasive elements are two value loaded concepts. The repeated emphasis on money as a potential solution to the drug problem (as evidenced by the comments of Sheriff Navarro), evokes the dearly held belief that "money talks," or, to use a drug lore analogy, that money is a "quick fix" for a problem. The report also summons up common revulsion at the idea of betrayal. As the reporter Braver points out, both congressional Democrats and Republicans feel betrayed. But also betrayed were those well scrubbed children seen earlier with the President and Nancy Reagan. It is they who are visually contrasted with the unwholesome drug users, and it is they who now may well face a similar fate. In this respect, Reagan is held guilty of the worst kind of vacillation and disloyalty.

What is the audience for this persuasive message? Like all television news reports it is ostensibly aimed at a mass heterogeneous audience, but there is some evidence to suggest that a more specific target is Congress itself. The reporter's final line, for example, though a clever play on the well known drug slogan, may be interpreted as a simple request. Why doesn't Congress just say no? The emphasis on the sense of betrayal experienced by representatives of both parties further suggests that one unarticulated purpose of the report is to get Congress angry so it retaliates against the President's budget action.

Analysis Three

In late 1986 television evangelist Oral Roberts told his viewing audience that unless he received immediate contributions of $4.5 million to provide funds for the Oral Roberts Medical Center he would be "taken away" by God. Roberts said God's deadline was March 1987.

Considerable outrage followed this appeal. And after Roberts repeated it again in early January, several television stations cancelled his air time. On January 9, the CBS Evening News broadcast a report on the situation.

The report opens with shots of Roberts preaching to television cameras as reporter Harry Smith reminds the viewer that Roberts was once a tent evangelist who moved to television

in 1954. Smith notes that Roberts' message has always been that "something good is going to happen to you." Now, however, he is saying that "something bad is going to happen to him."

There are more shots of Roberts addressing television cameras and then we hear his voice: "I need some very quick money. I mean I need it now. I need to turn it around enough so I know when March comes I won't be taken. I get to live."

This plea is followed by more images of Roberts standing before the staff of his medical center. Reporter Smith then explains that the evangelist's unusual request comes because his medical center is in financial trouble. Indeed the whole of Roberts' billion dollar "empire" is in trouble, including the dental school, which has been closed, and the law school, which has been given away. This commentary is accompanied by scenes of the exotically architected exteriors of these facilities.

Next, Smith notes that the medical center, built to hold 777 patients, now rarely treats more than 100. The viewer is shown shots of an empty waiting room and empty beds. The hospital is in so much trouble, Smith says, that it has taken to flying in patients for free as long as their insurance will pay for treatment.

The subsequent view is of the Tulsa skyline. Smith reports that critics of Roberts are hard to find in Tulsa because the evangelist's operation is still one of the biggest employers in

town. But now some objectors are coming forward. There is a shot of a newspaper headline that says, "Come off it, Oral." A Tulsa journalist appears on camera to suggest that people aren't very happy about the idea of God putting a price tag on someone's head.

Smith then calls upon Oral Roberts' son, who attempts to rebut these aspersions by saying that his father is not one to use scare tactics. Roberts himself refused to be interviewed.

The scene then shifts to show Roberts walking into a large auditorium or church and smiling happily at an applauding crowd. But despite this happy scene, Smith points out that in the last 10 years he has lost more than half of his viewers. In addition, according to critics, he's "exploiting those that remain."

We then see Rev. John Wolf of All Souls Unitarian Church, who reiterates the exploitation charge, calling Roberts' money raising strategy "emotional blackmail."

Finally, Roberts appears back on the screen, surrounded by white smocked hospital workers. We hear him say briefly in a pleading voice: "Please help me." Then we hear Smith's concluding remarks, accompanied by shots of Roberts and his colleagues praying: "Oral Roberts has always promised faith can make miracles happen. Now faith is not enough. He says only money can save his life. Harry Smith CBS News Tulsa."

The final line of this report states the main oppositional issue as defined by reporter Harry Smith: faith in God versus faith in money. Or, to put the opposition in the broadest terms, spirituality versus materialism. According to Smith, Roberts purports to be a man of faith while seeking cash as the utlimate solution to his problem.

The issue is spelled out in this deductive argument: Oral Roberts has made an extraordinary appeal for money, one that has shocked even some of his supporters. This appeal comes at a time when his empire is collapsing. Clearly he is desperate, and instead of turning to his faith to solve his problems, he is crassly manipulating the people who still follow him. Oral Roberts is thus a charlatan, if not worse, because he has sided with the demon dollar and turned his back on God. (Implicit here is the idea that God doesn't do financial deals.)

A rather straightforward conditional syllogism summarizes the argument: Oral Roberts has rejected his faith and is seeking money out of desperation. A person who rejects faith for material gain is a sinner. Therefore, Oral Roberts is a sinner.

To condemn a respected religious figure in this way might seem shocking. However, it is clear that to reporter Harry Smith, Roberts is hardly respectable. The use of testimony from a mainline Protestant minister supports this conclusion as does the reference early in the report to Roberts' tent evangelist

background. In addition, the selection of audio segments where Roberts' voice sounds especially obsequious, enhances an impression of sleaziness.

The reporter's attitude provides a good indication of the target audience of the report. Certainly it is not Roberts' followers or fundamentalist religious zealots. Rather, it seems clear that the typical member of the target audience is someone very much like the reporter himself, someone who would enjoy the irony of the public downfall of a self-appointed man of faith who gets messages from God. This audience is probably more sophisticated than Roberts' followers and is more likely to be northern than southern. And if members of this audience have joined a religious group, it seems more likely that it would be a liberal one like the Unitarians.

These assumptions about the target audience are supported by the main psychological appeal of the report. The shots of the oppulent Roberts campus and the discussion of large sums of money are contrasted with references to religious faith. This juxtaposition not only evokes Roberts' hypocrisy, but is likely to pique the moralistic idealism that one might expect to encounter in young reporters and other members of the educated classes. To this audience, mixing prayer and monetary solicitations has the same emotional appeal as putting A-1 Sauce on filet mignon. The strong value offended here is the belief in

the separation of one's intellectual or spiritual self from the crass demands of the marketplace. Selling out means becoming a prostitute, which is exactly what Oral Roberts has become.

There is also a strong value appeal, of course, to an even wider audience. Conventional Christians, for example, are likely to be put off by Roberts' failure to maintain that clear separation between what is God's and what is Caesar's.

Much of the evidence cited in this report in support of the main deductive argument has to do with persuading the audience that Roberts' empire is indeed fading. The shots of the empty hospital beds are especially powerful. Also persuasive are the exterior scenes of the dental and law schools, which are accompanied by the reporter's pronouncement of closings or transfer of ownership. Finally, presenting another journalist and a mainline minister, helps establish the credibility of the assertion that Roberts' has slipped from respectability. Both of these speakers use terms such as "price tag" or "blackmail," which are colorful and emotionally charged references to possible sharp or illegitimate business practices.

In sum, it seems clear that the reporter's objective was to demonstrate that Oral Roberts continues to operate as a fly-by-night tent evangelist. His hypocrisy and violation of values proves him to be a character worthy of contempt and ridicule.

Conclusions

Each of the three reports discussed in this paper reveal themselves as tightly packaged persuasive arguments when analyzed using neo-Aristotelian criteria. Each defines oppositional issues, sets out a logical deductive argument, and supports that argument with reasoned and emotional evidence. Perhaps most interestingly, each report also seems to define a target audience that is far more specific than the mass audience typically assumed for network newscasts. This audience is then encouraged to accept the persuader's viewpoint by the use of value-laden statements and by certain credibility enhancing techniques such as authoritative tone of voice or the association of the reporter's person with the seemingly irrefutable evidence of pictorial images.

But are such persuasive arguments news? The answer to this question is "no" if one defines news as a detached, accurate and objective view of an event untainted by the thoughts or feelings of the reporter. But if one accepts Walter Lippmann's perspective mentioned at the beginning of this paper, the answer to the question is a qualified "yes." Such reports are news if the audience accepts them as a useful model of reality--a description that offers insight from one viewpoint.

Of course, the three reports discussed here cannot be said to represent all news reports. The persuasive traits that appear so outstanding in these reports may be less evident or nonexistent in a simple news story about an automobile accident or the passage of a piece of legislation. However, it seems inevitable that "objectivity," at least as it is often naively construed, will fall victim to rhetoric whenever reporters are asked to deal with complex questions of policy or morality. The answer to this problem, if it is indeed a problem, is not simply more impassioned calls for objective reporting. Rather it is greater public awareness of the argumentative structure of news and the presentational formats in which that structure is concealed.

Appendix A

Report Transcripts

The Bull Market, Jan. 8, 1987: 1 min. 31 sec.

Rather: The record breaking bull market of the 1980s...called the most successful millionaire maker of all time. Today as CBS business correspondent Ray Brady reports, Wall Street smashed yet another barrier.

Brady: Outside the stock exchange they handed out cigars and inside a roar of a thousand traders [shots of people lighting up cigars followed by traders on the floor of exchange]. The Dow Jones industrial average had done it...rising over eight points to close at over 2,000 for the first time in history [graphics showing level of stocks].

Trader: Great! I'm always a buyer. I'm a bull. I love it. [Cut to shot of ticker display.]

Brady: Today was a milestone in the biggest bull market in history. [More shots of floor of exchange followed by graph.] In 1897, the Dow stood at 40...not until 1956 did it hit 500...then taking 16 years to double and staying around that level until the current big push. With interest rates low, investors hope to get a better return by buying stocks [more shots of frantic traders].

Market analyst William LeFevre: The smaller investor is in this market and there may be some scrambling, feeling that, you know, here we are the magic number of 2,000, maybe they missed the boat.

Brady: [Shot of brokerage house in Seattle] And around the country today, investors flocked into brokerage houses to be on hand [cut to shot of stock ticker] for the big day.

Investor: I'm sure it will continue to go. Who knows how far? But I think it will continue.

Second investor: At over 2,000 it looks now like it's uncontrolled to 3,000.

Brady: [Shots of cameras looking down on exchange floor] Some thought all the publicity from today's big rise might push stocks

even higher. [Cut to shot of Brady in studio.] Nobody can be sure of that because the economy is still weak. But as one broker put it, tonight nobody's selling; everybody's saying let the money ride and we'll see what happens. Dan.

Reagan's Drug Budget, Jan. 8, 1987: 2 min.

Rather: You may recall that just before the November elections, President Reagan launched what he promised would be a crusade against drugs. His new post-election budget calls for deep cuts in drug law enforcement. Rita Braver has been sampling reactions.

Braver: [Shots of Nancy Reagan with teens singing anti-drug song] Remember the great drug offensive of 1986? The first couple rallied the nation [shot of Nancy and President giving drug message]. The government recruited super stars to spread the word [shot of athletes with kids].

Kids and black athletes: Say no to drugs.

Braver: [Shot of Reagan signing drug bill] And eight days before the election with great ceremony, the President signed a new law pushing anti-drug spending to almost $4 billion. [Cut to shots of kids wearing "just say no" t-shirts watching President.]

Reagan: The American people want their government to get tough and to go on the offensive...and that's exactly what we intend to do.

Braver: [Shots of drug arrests being made; officers running with weapons; prisioners being led away] Now, however, in its latest budget request, the administration has slashed nearly a billion dollars from drug busting programs...the biggest cut, $225 million for state and local law enforcement grants. In Congress, both Democrats and Republicans said they felt betrayed.

Rep. Benjamin Gilman: At a time when we have an increased amount of product coming into the country, an increased amount of trafficking on our streets, we need to do more, not less.

Braver: [Shot of Presidential seal above statistical report] The White House responded with a fact sheet, claiming that those big bucks in the original plan were for startup costs of new programs, one time only expenses [graphic now has words, "one time expenses"]. The President's former drug adviser defended the White House, arguing that spending won't cure the drug problem.

Carlton Turner: And as long as we think we're going to solve that by throwing money into areas we're never going to solve it. Let's hold the user accountable for his or her actions.

Braver: [Shot of teacher talking to kids in classroom, followed by shot of unconscious person being wheeled into hospital emergency room] But funding for education and treatment for users is down too and local governments say that will hurt.

Nick Navarro, Broward County Sheriff: It takes three things to win a war--and we are at war with drugs--that's money, money and more money. And that's the answer.

Braver: [on camera] The response from Capitol Hill to the President's new drug budget may have a familiar ring: Congress is likely to just say no. Rita Braver CBS News Washington.

Report on Oral Roberts, Jan 9, 1987: 2 mins., 20 secs.

Rather: One of television's better known evangelists is under criticism even from some people in his own home town. CBS reporter Harry Smith explains what Oral Roberts' latest message was and why it stirred such an uproar.

Smith:q [Shots of Roberts preaching] Since Oral Roberts took his sermons from the tents to TV in 1954, part of his message has always been, something good is going to happen to you. But last Sunday he told his audience that something bad was going to happen to him [shot of Roberts addressing camera] unless they came up with four and a half million dollars.

Roberts: I need some very quick money. I mean I need it now. I'm desperate to turn this around. I need to turn it around enough so I know when March comes I won't be taken. I get to live.

Smith: [shots of Roberts and people in white medical smocks] Roberts claims that God has mandated him to raise money for a missionary project. He says God has told him that if he doesn't he'll die. [Shots of exterior of Roberts's medical center]. His half billion dollar Tulsa based evangelical empire in in trouble. The university's dental school has closed...the law school given away...and the medical center built to hold 777 patients rarely treats more than 100 at a time [shots of interior of hospital showing empty bed and waiting room]. [Cut to Smith on camera.] The hospital is in so much financial trouble that it now offers

to fly patients here for free if they have insurance to pay for their stay. [Cut to shot of Tulas skyline.] Roberts is still one of the biggest employers in Tulsa and critics have been hard to find. But his latest call for cash has changed all that. [Cut to shot showing masthead of Tulsa newspaper, followed by shot of headline reading, "Come off it, Oral."]

Mary Hargrove, Tulsa journalist: People don't like the idea from the letters and calls that we're getting that he has put a price tag or God has put a price tag on his head. [Cut to shot showing Oral Roberts' son sitting in room with campus view.]

Smith: Oral Roberts wouldn't talk to us, but his son did.

Richard Roberts: My father is not a person that uses scare tactics or fear tactics, but he does tell people what God speaks.

Smith: [Shot of Roberts walking in front of church crowd; shots of clapping people] But fewer and fewer people are hearing Oral's message. He's lost more than half his TV audience in the last 10 years. And critics charge he's exploiting those who remain.

Rev. John Wolf, All Souls Unitarian Church: These people have made a connection to him and he's exploiting these people now, probably with the ultimate device you could imagine. That's emotional blackmail.

Roberts: [Shot of him praying with people in medical smocks] Please help me.

Smith: [Shots of Roberts praying continue] Oral Roberts has always promised faith can make miracles happen. Now faith is not enough. He says only money can save his life. Harry Smith CBS News Tulsa.

References

1. Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1954), pp. 15-16.

2. Fred Fedler, *Reporting for the Print Media* (3rd ed.),(New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich), p. 34.

3. Forbes Hill, "Convetional Wisdom--Traditional Form--The President's Message of November 3, 1969," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 58 (1972): 374.

4. Edwin Black, *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), p. 17.

5. Hill, op. cit.